



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,308	07/31/2003	Gerard Chauvel	TI-35433 (1962-05412)	1887

23494 7590 01/22/2007
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

PETRANEK, JACOB ANDREW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2183

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/631,308

Applicant(s)

CHAUVEL ET AL.

Examiner

Jacob Petranek

Art Unit

2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-27 and 30-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-27 and 30-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16, 18-27, and 30-41 are pending.
2. The office acknowledges the following papers:

Claims and arguments filed on 11/22/2006.

New Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-7, 12-16, and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 12 contain the limitation "wherein said logic executes instructions from both said stack-based instruction set and said second instruction set." Upon a cursory glance through the specification, no support for the limitation is found to convey possession of the claimed invention.

5. Claims 2-7, 13-16, and 18-27 are rejected due to their dependency.

New Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786).

8. As per claim 8:

Feierbach disclosed a method of processing instructions in a processor, comprising:

Fetch logic in a core of the processor receiving instructions from a first instruction set which comprises stack-based instructions (Feierbach: Figure 2 elements 104 and 227, column 5 lines 62-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-7 and column 7 lines 7-18)(Feierbach is silent as to where the PC is maintained, which is read as fetch logic. Official notice is given that the PC for fetching instructions from the instruction cache outside the core could be contained within the core of the processor. Element 227 receives the fetched instructions. The extended instructions are the second instruction set that provides register-based operations on element 204. The regular stack instructions are the first instruction set that provides stack-based operations on element 202.);

Said fetch logic receiving instructions from a second instruction set which comprises memory-based and register-based instructions (Feierbach: Figure 2

Art Unit: 2183

elements 104 and 227, column 5 lines 62-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-7 and column 7 lines 7-18)(Feierbach is silent as to where the PC is maintained, which is read as fetch logic. Official notice is given that the PC for fetching instructions from the instruction cache outside the core could be contained within the core of the processor. Element 227 receives the fetched instructions. The extended instructions are the second instruction set that provides register-based operations on element 204. The regular stack instructions are the first instruction set that provides stack-based operations on element 202.); and

Executing said received instructions from the first and second instruction sets (Feierbach: Figure 2 elements 202 and 204, column 7 lines 27-37)(The execution units execute both the register-based and stack-based operations.).

9. As per claim 9:

Feierbach disclosed the method of claim 8 further comprising forming a sequence of instructions from both of said first and second instruction sets (Feierbach: Column 5 lines 62-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-7)(Instructions that are to be executed can be from both ISA's.).

10. As per claim 10:

Feierbach disclosed the method of claim 8 further comprising an instruction from said second instruction set that targets a stack included in said core, said stack having a top, and storing a value at the top of the stack in a register in the processor (Feierbach: Column 7 lines 50-65)(Official notice is given that stack operations push and pop at the top of the stack.).

11. As per claim 11:

Feierbach disclosed the method of claim 10 further comprising updating an address stored in another register that points to the top of the stack (Feierbach: Column 7 lines 50-65)(Official notice is given that a register stores the pointer to the top of the stack that is updated upon pop and push operations.).

New Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Batten et al. (U.S. 6,256,725).

14. As per claim 1:

Feierbach disclosed a processor, comprising:

A core (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 104, column 5 lines 40-50);

A multi-entry stack contained within the core and usable in at least a stack-based instruction set and comprising a plurality of entries, all of said entries of said multi-entry stack correspond to a subset of entries at the top of a main stack implemented in memory outside of said core (Feierbach: Figure 2 elements 210 and 224, column 7 lines 8-18 and column 8 lines 2-20)(The stack can pop and push data to the data cache.

Element 224 corresponds to memory outside of the core that is fetched for the stack inside the core. The core stack is the top of the stack cache, which is external.);

Logic contained in said core and coupled to said stack, the logic manages the stack (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 202, column 7 lines 50-65); and

A plurality of registers contained in said core and coupled to the logic and addressable through a second instruction set that provides register-based and memory-based operations and (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 208, column 6 lines 1-7 and 53-65)(The extended instructions are the second instruction set that provides register-based operations on element 204. The regular stack instructions are the first instruction set that provides stack based operations on element 202); and

Wherein said core executes instructions from both said stack-based instruction set and said second instruction set (Feierbach: Figure 2 elements 202 and 204, column 6 lines 1-7)(The extended instructions are the second instruction set that provides register-based operations on element 204. The regular stack instructions are the first instruction set that provides stack based operations on element 202.); and

An instruction fetch logic contained in said core, said instruction fetch logic receives at least stack-based instructions from the stack-based instruction set (Feierbach: Figure 2 elements 104 and 227, column 5 lines 62-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-7 and column 7 lines 7-18)(Feierbach is silent as to where the PC is maintained, which is read as fetch logic. Official notice is given that the PC for fetching instructions from the instruction cache outside the core could be contained within the core of the processor. Element 227 receives the fetched instructions. The regular stack

instructions are the first instruction set that provides stack-based operations on element 202.);

Feierbach failed to teach wherein said logic executes instructions from both said stack-based instruction set and said second instruction set.

However, Batten disclosed wherein said logic executes instructions from both said stack-based instruction set and said second instruction set (Batten: Figure 4 element 48, column 5 lines 16-43)(Batten disclosed sharing the execution units to execute both stack-based and register-based instructions. In addition, according to “In re Japikse” (181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950)), shifting the location of parts doesn't give patentability over prior art.).

The advantage of a shared datapath is that it results in improved performance and a significant reduction in static code size compared to normal processors (Batten: Column 3 lines 22-34). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by these advantages to combine the datapaths of Feierbach into a single shared datapath. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a shared datapath in Feierbach for the advantages of improved performance and reduction in code size.

15. As per claim 2:

Feierbach and Batten disclosed the processor of claim 1 wherein the stack has a top and the stack is accessible within the second instruction set through at least one of the registers in which a value is stored that is present at the top of the stack (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 208, column 8 lines 33-50)(The stack is accessible through the copy

unit that transfers the stack to the register file, where then the register-based instruction have access to the stack values.).

16. As per claim 4:

Feierbach and Batten disclosed the processor of claim 1 wherein the stack-based instruction set accesses operands from the stack and places results from operations on the stack and, as a result of accessing operands the stack and placing results on the stack, at least some of the registers are updated (Feierbach: Column 7 lines 50-65)(Official notice is given that when operands are popped and pushed to the stack, a top of the stack pointer is accordingly updated.).

17. As per claim 6:

Feierbach and Batten disclosed the processor of claim 1 further comprising a pair of parallel address generation units coupled to said logic which are used to compute memory source and destination addresses and wherein a register includes the top of the multi-entry stack, thereby permitting a block of data to be moved between a memory area and the stack by execution of a single instruction with a repeat loop (Feierbach: Column 8 lines 2-20)(It's obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the memory operation moving the stack to external memory could be implemented with a repeating store/load instruction.).

18. As per claim 7:

Feierbach and Batten disclosed the processor of claim 1 wherein the second instruction set comprises an instruction that retrieves operands from memory, performs a computation on the operands, and places the result on the stack (Feierbach: Figure 2

Art Unit: 2183

element 208, column 8 lines 33-50)(The register-base operations retrieve operands from the register file, perform a function on the operands, and when placing results in the register that's the top of the stack, has that functionality when the register file is transferred back to the stack by the copy unit.).

19. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Batten et al. (U.S. 6,256,725), further in view of Patel et al. (U.S. 6,826,749).

20. As per claim 3:

Feierbach and Batten disclosed the processor of claim 1.

Feierbach and Batten failed to teach wherein the stack has a top that is addressable by a memory mapped address, and the memory mapped address is stored in a register which is accessed by the second instruction set.

However, Patel disclosed wherein the stack has a top that is addressable by a memory mapped address, and the memory mapped address is stored in a register which is accessed by the second instruction set (Patel: Figure 3 element 44, column 5 lines 14-26; Figure 5, column 7 lines 31-54)(The register stores a pointer that points to the top of the stack. Thus having the same functionality.).

Feierbach disclosed a stack and disclosed instructions that pop and push values to the stack, but is silent on the details of addressing the stack properly to ensure the top value is addressed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Feierbach failing to disclose how the top of the stack is addressed to find Patel that

uses a register to address the top of the stack. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a stack pointer register for the advantage of being able to properly address the top of the stack.

21. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Batten et al. (U.S. 6,256,725), further in view of Gee et al. (U.S. 6,374,286).

22. As per claim 5:

Feierbach and Batten disclosed the processor of claim 1.

Feierbach and Batten failed to teach further comprising a first program counter usable in the execution of the stack-based instruction set and a second program counter usable in the execution of a micro-sequence that comprises instructions from both the stack-based and second instruction sets.

However, Gee disclosed further comprising a first program counter usable in the execution of the stack-based instruction set (Gee: Figure 2 element 250, column 11 lines 1-8)(The PC register when combined with Feierbach is used for the standard stack instructions) and a second program counter usable in the execution of a micro-sequence that comprises instructions from both the stack-based and second instruction sets (Gee: Figure 2 element 226, column 9 lines 18-26)(Feierbach: Column 6 lines 1-7)(The micro-program register is used for the expanded instructions of Feierbach. It's obvious to one ordinary skill in the art that the expanded instructions are more complex and could be broken up into multiple simpler instructions that the microPC could be

Art Unit: 2183

used to control. It's also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Feierbach states that the expanded instructions are primarily register-based, but also could be stack-based instructions as well.).

The advantage of using a second program counter for the expanded instructions is that they could be complex instructions that could be broken into multiple simpler instructions to execute on the processor. A second program counter could be used to fetch the simpler instructions from a complex instruction to track the progress of the overall complex instruction. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by this advantage to include a second program counter to implement the complex instructions. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a second program counter for the complex operations of the expanded instructions of Feierbach for the advantage of keeping track of the progress of the instruction.

23. Claims 12-15, 18-24, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Patel et al. (U.S. 6,826,749), in view of Batten et al. (U.S. 6,256,725) in view of Hennessy et al. ("Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach").

24. As per claim 12:

A core (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 104, column 5 lines 40-50);

A multi-entry stack contained in said core and having a top and usable in at least a stack-based instruction set (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 210, column 7 lines 50-

65)(Official notice is given that the stack contains a top that is accessed by stack operations.);

Logic contained in said core and coupled to said stack, the logic manages the stack (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 202, column 7 lines 50-65);

Memory coupled to said logic and located outside said core (Feierbach: Figure 1 elements 110 and 108); and

A plurality of registers contained in said core and coupled to the logic and addressable through a second instruction set that provides register-based and memory-based operations (Feierbach: Figure 2 element 208, column 6 lines 1-7 and 53-65)(The extended instructions are the second instruction set that provides register-based operations on element 204. The regular stack instructions are the first instruction set that provides stack-based operations on element 202);

Wherein said multi-entry stack comprises a plurality of entries, all of said entries of said multi-entry stack correspond to a subset of entries of a main stack implemented in said memory (Feierbach: Figure 2 elements 210 and 224, column 7 lines 8-18 and column 8 lines 2-20)(The stack can pop and push data to the data cache. Element 224 corresponds to memory outside of the core that is fetched for the stack inside the core. The core stack is the top of the stack cache, which is external.).

Feierbach failed to teach wherein a first register includes an address through which the top of the stack is accessed and a second register in which a value at the top of the stack is stored; wherein said logic executes instructions from both said stack-based instruction set and said second instruction set; and wherein at least one of the

registers are used to calculate addresses in parallel, said addresses being calculated in accordance with any of a plurality of addressing modes specified by the second instruction set.

However, Patel disclosed wherein a first register includes an address through which the top of the stack is accessed and a second register in which a value at the top of the stack is stored (Patel: Figure 3 element 44, column 5 lines 14-26; Figure 5, column 7 lines 30-54)(Optop register is a pointer that points to the top of the stack. The second register is part of the stack that stores the top value.)

Feierbach disclosed a stack and disclosed instructions that pop and push values to the stack, but is silent on the details of addressing the stack properly to ensure the top value is addressed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Feierbach failing to disclose how the top of the stack is addressed to find Patel that uses a register to address the top of the stack. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a stack pointer register for the advantage of being able to properly address the top of the stack.

Feierbach and Patel failed to teach wherein said logic executes instructions from both said stack-based instruction set and said second instruction set and wherein at least one of the registers are used to calculate addresses in parallel, said addresses being calculated in accordance with any of a plurality of addressing modes specified by the second instruction set.

However, Batten disclosed wherein said logic executes instructions from both said stack-based instruction set and said second instruction set (Batten: Figure 4

Art Unit: 2183

element 48, column 5 lines 16-43)(Batten disclosed sharing the execution units to execute both stack-based and register-based instructions. In addition, according to “In re Japikse” (181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950)), shifting the location of parts doesn't give patentability over prior art.).

The advantage of a shared datapath is that it results in improved performance and a significant reduction in static code size compared to normal processors (Batten: Column 3 lines 22-34). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by these advantages to combine the datapaths of Feierbach into a single shared datapath. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a shared datapath in Feierbach for the advantages of improved performance and reduction in code size.

Feierbach, Patel, and Batten failed to teach wherein at least one of the registers are used to calculate addresses in parallel, said addresses being calculated in accordance with any of a plurality of addressing modes specified by the second instruction set.

However, Hennessy disclosed wherein at least one of the registers are used to calculate addresses in parallel, said addresses being calculated in accordance with any of a plurality of addressing modes specified by the second instruction set (Hennessy: Figures 2.6 and 2.7, section 2.3)(Register addressing mode and register indirect modes for load and stores use a register for calculating the effective address.).

Patel disclosed data memory accesses to the data cache through load and store instruction, but left out the details of the addressing modes used to calculate the

Art Unit: 2183

memory address needed to access the data or storing the data within the data cache

(Patel: Figure 3 element 58, column 5 lines 60-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-3).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look for different types of addressing modes that could be used to load and store data from memory. Hennessy disclosed many different types of addressing modes for data memory instructions.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the addressing modes of Hennessy to Patel's load and store instructions.

25. As per claim 13:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 12 wherein the stack-based instruction set accesses operands from the multi-entry stack and places results from operations on the multi-entry stack and, as a result of accessing operands from the multi-entry stack and placing results on the multi-entry stack thereby causing the address in the first register to be changed (Patel: Figure 3 element 44 and 50, column 6 lines 43-56; Figure 5, column 7 lines 30-54)(The pointer register and register holding the top value of the stack are updated each time the stack changed. Thus having the same functionality.).

26. As per claim 14:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 13 wherein the address in the first register is incremented or decremented depending on whether the register is used as a source or a destination, respectively, for an operation (Patel: Figure 3 elements 44 and 50, column 6 lines 43-56; Figure 5, column 7 lines 30-

54)(The pointer is incremented or decremented depending on if the top value is popped off the stack or if a value is pushed on the stack. Thus having the same functionality.).

27. As per claim 15:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 12 wherein the stack-based instruction set comprises Java Bytecodes (Patel: Column 4 lines 33-46).

28. As per claim 18:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 12 wherein at least one of the registers includes an offset usable in the calculation of addresses (Hennessy: Figures 2.6 and 2.7, section 2.3)(Register indirect or indexed addressing modes use registers as pointers to the effective address. Displacement addressing mode uses an immediate value to add to a register value for the effective address.).

29. As per claim 19:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 12 wherein the second instruction set comprises an instruction that moves data from a register or memory to a register, and consequently to the multi-entry stack (Patel: Figure 3 element 58, column 5 lines 60-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-3)(Load/store instructions move data to/from the data cache. Thus having the same functionality.).

30. As per claim 20:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 19.

Wherein the instruction that moves data includes a plurality of bits of that encode

one of a plurality of addressing modes (Hennessy: Figures 2.6 and 2.7, section 2.3).

31. As per claim 21:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 20 wherein the addressing modes include a mode in which the instruction that moves data includes an immediate value and a reference to a register containing a base address, wherein the immediate value and the base address are added together to generate a source memory address for the move instruction (Hennessy: Figures 2.6 and 2.7, section 2.3)(Displacement addressing mode uses an immediate value that's added to the value contained within a register to obtain the effective address.).

32. As per claim 22:

Claim 22 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 21. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21.

33. As per claim 23:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 20 wherein the addressing modes include a mode in which the instruction that moves data includes references to two registers in which memory addresses are stored, one register being a predetermined index register, the memory addresses from the two registers are added together to calculate a source memory address used to complete the move instruction, and the address in the predetermined index register is incremented (Hennessy: Figure 14, column 11 lines 40-67 continued to column 12 lines 1-26)(Autoincrement adds two register values and increments the index register.).

34. As per claim 24:

Claim 24 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 23. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 23.

35. As per claim 27:

Claim 27 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 6. Therefore, claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6.

36. Claims 16 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Patel et al. (U.S. 6,826,749), in view of Batten et al. (U.S. 6,256,725) in view of Hennessy et al. ("Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach"), further in view of Gee et al. (U.S. 6,374,286).

37. As per claim 16:

Claim 16 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 5. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

38. As per claim 26:

Claim 26 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 5. Therefore, claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

39. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Patel et al. (U.S. 6,826,749), in view of Batten et al. (U.S. 6,256,725) in view of Hennessy et al. ("Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach"), further in view of Hendler et al. (U.S. 6,473,777) and Brassac et al. (U.S. 6,928,539).

Art Unit: 2183

40. As per claim 25:

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy disclosed the processor of claim 12.

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, and Hennessy failed to teach wherein the processor is configured to be coupled to a separate processor on which an operating system is executed.

However, Hendler disclosed wherein the processor is configured to be coupled to a separate processor (Hendler: Figure 2 element 102, column 2 lines 32-46)(Element 102 executes various overhead activities associated with java instructions. Thus having the same functionality.).

The advantage of having another processor to run processes is that it can run overhead tasks, such as compilation and garbage collection, which needs to be done to execute Java instructions (Hendler: Column 1 lines 44-64). The processor running Java instruction will make gains in performance by having another processor handler these overhead tasks (Hendler: Column 1 lines 44-64). The performance increase of a java stack-based processor would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to use another processor for overhead tasks. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add another processor to Patel's system that deals with executing overhead tasks for the advantage of increased performance in the java processor.

Feierbach, Patel, Batten, Hennessy, and Hendler failed to teach a separate processor on which an operating system is executed.

However, Brassac disclosed a separate processor on which an operating system is executed (Brassac: Figure 2 element 8, column 1 lines 58-67 continued to column 2 lines 1-7)(The separate processor runs operating system tasks for other processors. Thus having the same functionality.).

The advantage of having another processor to run processes is that it can run overhead tasks, such as compilation and garbage collection, which needs to be done to execute Java instructions (Hendler: Column 1 lines 44-64). Executing instructions for the operating system is another such task that can be considered an overhead task. Running the operating system on the separate processor would have increased the performance of the java processor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by this increased performance of the java processor to have the separate processor run OS instructions. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement a separate processor running OS instructions for the added performance to the java processor.

41. Claims 30-35, 37, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Hendler et al. (U.S. 6,473,777).

42. As per claim 30:

Feierbach disclosed a system, comprising:

A co-processor having a core comprises a hardware stack, fetch logic, and registers, said fetch logic receiving stack-based instructions from a first instruction set

Art Unit: 2183

(Feierbach: Figure 1 element 104, column 5 lines 62-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-7; Figure 2 elements 208, 210, and 227, column 6 lines 53-65)(Feierbach is silent as to where the PC is maintained, which is read as fetch logic. Official notice is given that the PC for fetching instructions from the instruction cache outside the core could be contained within the core of the processor. Element 227 receives the fetched instructions. The fetch logic receives stack based regular instructions and register-based extended instructions.), and the core of the co-processor is configured to execute stack-based instructions from a first instruction set and instructions from a second instruction set that provides memory-based and register-based operations (Feierbach: Figure 1 element 104, column 5 lines 62-67 continued to column 6 lines 1-7)(The fetch logic receives stack based regular instructions and register-based extended instructions.),

Wherein said hardware stack comprises a subset of entries at a top of a memory-based stack implemented in memory outside of said core (Feierbach: Figure 2 elements 210 and 224, column 7 lines 8-18 and column 8 lines 2-20)(The stack can pop and push data to the data cache. Element 224 corresponds to memory outside of the core that is fetched for the stack inside the core. The core stack is the top of the stack cache, which is external.).

Feierbach failed to teach a main processor unit coupled to the co-processor.

However, Hendler disclosed a main processor unit (Hendler: Figure 2 element 102, column 2 lines 32-46)(Element 102 executes various overhead activities associated with java instructions. Thus having the same functionality.).

The advantage of having another processor to run processes is that it can run overhead tasks, such as compilation and garbage collection, which needs to be done to execute Java instructions (Hendler: Column 1 lines 44-64). The processor running Java instruction will make gains in performance by having another processor handler these overhead tasks (Hendler: Column 1 lines 44-64). The performance increase of a java stack-based processor would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to use another processor for overhead tasks. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add another processor to Patel's system that deals with executing overhead tasks for the advantage of increased performance in the java processor.

43. As per claim 31:

Feierbach and Hendler disclosed the system of claim 30 wherein stack-based instructions comprise Java bytecodes (Feierbach: Column 5 lines 9-29)

44. As per claim 32:

Feierbach and Hendler disclosed the system of claim 31 further including a compiler coupled to said co-processor, said compiler receives Java bytecodes and replaces at least one group of bytecodes by a sequence of instructions from the second instruction set and provides said sequence to the co-processor for execution (Feierbach: Column 5 lines 9-29).

45. As per claim 33:

Feierbach and Hendler disclosed the system of claim 32 wherein the sequence also includes stack-based instructions from the first instruction set (Feierbach: Column 5

lines 9-29).

46. As per claim 34:

Feierbach and Hendler disclosed the system of claim 30 wherein the system comprises a cellular telephone (Feierbach: Column 5 lines 40-50.).

47. As per claim 35:

Claim 35 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 2. Therefore, claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

48. As per claim 37:

Claim 37 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 4. Therefore, claim 37 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 4.

49. As per claim 41:

Claim 41 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 6. Therefore, claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6.

50. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Hendler et al. (U.S. 6,473,777), further in view of Patel et al. (U.S. 6,826,749).

51. As per claim 36:

Claim 36 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 3. Therefore, claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.

52. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Feierbach et al. (U.S. 6,088,786), in view of Hendler et al. (U.S. 6,473,777), further in view of Gee et al. (U.S. 6,374,286).

53. As per claim 38:

Claim 38 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 5. Therefore, claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

54. As per claim 39:

Claim 39 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 5. Therefore, claim 39 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

55. As per claim 40:

Claim 40 essentially recites the same limitations of claim 5. Therefore, claim 40 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

Response to arguments

56. The arguments presented by Applicant in the response, received on 11/22/2006 are considered persuasive.

57. Applicant argues "Patel failed to teach a hardware stack contained within the processor core for claim 1."

This argument is found to be persuasive for the following reason. The examiner agrees that the hardware stack of Patel is outside of the core. However, a new ground of rejection has been given.

58. Applicant argues "Patel failed to teach executing stack-based and register-based instructions for claim 1."

This argument is found to be persuasive for the following reason. The examiner agrees that Patel doesn't execute both types of instructions and only translates one to the other type. However, a new ground of rejection has been given.

59. Applicant argues "Patel fails to teach fetching within the core for claim 8."

This argument is not to be persuasive for the following reason. The examiner agrees that the fetching unit of Patel is outside of the core. However, a new ground of rejection has been given.

Conclusion

The following is text cited from 37 CFR 1.111(c): In amending in reply to a rejection of claims in an application or patent under reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. The applicant or patent owner must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Petranek whose telephone number is 571-272-5988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jacob Petranek
Examiner, Art Unit 2183



EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100